

DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY FOR PATENT APPLICATION

Filing Date: September 5, 2003			
Examiner:			
as stated below next to my name.			
only one name is listed below) or an isted below) of the subject matter which is tion entitled SEMICONDUCTOR			
he specification of which is attached hereto.			
e contents of the above-identified y amendment referred to above. It is material to the examination of this eral Regulations, S. 1.56(a).			
I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) or 365(b) of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate, or 365(a) of any PCT international application which designated at least one country other than the United States of America, listed below and have also identified below any foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate or of any PCT international application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed:			
Certified Copy Priority Claimed Attached			
x Yes No Yes No			
Yes No Yes No			

I hereby claim the benefit under 3 listed below:	5 U.S.C. 119(e) of any Unite	ed States provisional application(s)
Application No:	Filing Date:	
any PCT international application insofar as the subject matter of ea United States or PCT International	n designating the United State ich of the claims of this applial application in the manner platty to disclose information became available between the	cation is not disclosed in the prior provided by the first paragraph of which is material to patentability at filing date of the prior
US Parent Application No. or PCT Parent Appln. No.	Parent Filing Date	Parent Patent Number (if applicable)
15,867; Peter A. Nieves, Reg. No. 175 Canal Street, Manchester, No.	2. 48,173; Peter W. Murphy, 2 w Hampshire 03101 (Televin M. Drucker, Reg. No. 47 d. Cushing Street, Tucson, Ar power of substitution and re	vocation, to prosecute this
Please direct all future correspond Norman P. Soloway, HAYES So 85701 (Telephone: 520-882-7623	OLOWAY P.C., 130 W. Cus	
punishable by fine or imprisonme	and belief are believed to be nowledge that willful false st ent, or both, under Section 10	
Full name of sole or first invento	r: Kazuhiko KAJIGAYA	
First Inventor's signature Residence: Citizenship: Tokyo, Japanese	// // / 4=	Date May 10, 2004

Post Office Address: c/o Elpida Memory, Inc., 2-1, Yaesu 2-chome, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan

Full name of second joint inventor: Hiromasa NODA
First Inventor's signature Thomasa Roda Date May 10, 2004 Residence: Tokyo, Japan
Citizenship: Japanese
Post Office Address: <u>c/o Elpida Memory, Inc., 2-1, Yaesu 2-chome, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan</u>
- 00t 01tio0 1 to 000 - 000 2.ptsa 1.tempy,
Full name of third joint inventor: Shinichi MIYATAKE
Second Inventor's signature Shinishi Migntake Date May 12, 2004
Residence: Tokyo, Japan
Citizenship: Japanese
Post Office Address: <u>c/o Hitachi ULSI Systems Co., Ltd., 22-1, Josuihoncho 5-chome,</u>
Kodaira-shi, Tokyo, Japan
Full name of fourth joint inventor: Riichiro TAKEMURA
Second Inventor's signature Richiro Jakemura Finate May 12, 2004 Residence: Tokyo, Japan
Citizenship: Japanese
Post Office Address: c/o Hitachi, Ltd., 6, Kanda Surugadai 4-chome, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo, Japan
Full name of fifth joint inventor:
Second Inventor's signature Tomonow Sekignel Date May 12, 2004 Residence: Tokyo, Japan
Citizenship: Japanese
Post Office Address: <u>c/o Hitachi, Ltd., 6, Kanda Surugadai 4-chome, Chiyoda-ku,</u>
Tokyo, Japan
Full name of sixth joint inventor:
Second Inventor's signature Takeshi Sakata Bate May 12, 2004
Residence: Tokyo, Japan
Citizenship: <u>Japanese</u> Post Office Address: c/o Hitachi, Ltd., 6, Kanda Surugadai 4-chome, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo Japan

IMPORTANT NOTICE RE DUTY OF CANDOR AND GOOD FAITH

The Duty of Disclosure requirements of Section 1.56(a), of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations are as follows:

A duty of candor and good faith toward the Patent and Trademark Office rests on the inventor, on each attorney or agent who prepares or prosecutes the application and on every other individual who is substantively involved in the preparation or prosecution of the application and who is associated with the inventor, with the assignee or with anyone to whom there is an obligation to assign the application. All such individuals have a duty to disclose to the Office information they are aware of which is material to the examination of the application. Such information is material where there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable examiner would consider it important in deciding whether to allow the application to issue as a patent. The duty is commensurate with the degree of involvement in the preparation or prosecution of the application.

By virtue of this regulation each inventor executing the Declaration for the filing of a Patent Application acknowledges his duty to disclose information of which he is aware and which may be material to the examination of the application.

Inherent in this is the duty to disclose any knowledge or belief that the invention:

- (a) was ever known or used in the United States of America before his invention thereof;
- (b) was patented or described in any printed publication in any country before his invention thereof or more than one year prior to the actual filing date of the U.S. patent application;
- (c) was in public use or on sale in the United States of America more than one year prior to the actual filing date of the U.S. patent application; or
- (d) has been patented or made the subject of inventor's certificate issued before the actual filing date of the U.S. patent application in any country foreign to the United States of America on an application filed by him or his legal representatives or assigns more than twelve months before the actual filing date in the United States.

NOTE: The "Information" concerned includes, but is not limited to, all published applications and patents, including applicant's and assignee's own, U.S. or foreign applications and patents, as well as any other pertinent prior art known, or which becomes known, to the inventor or his representatives. Where English language equivalents of foreign language documents are known, they should be identified and, when possible, copies supplied. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in a patent issued on the application being held invalid even if the known prior art which is not supplied is material to only one claim of that patent.